Human Events *A Weekly Analysis for the American Citizen*
Combined with the Magazine ANALYSIS
Editorial Office 1710 Rhode Island Ave., N. W., WASHINGTON 6, D. C. *Telephone* NATIONAL 2066

VOL. VIII, NO. 25, *Issue Number* 386, JUNE 20, 1951 ★ *Editor:* FRANK C. HANIGHEN ★ *Associate Editor:* FRANK CHODOROV

UNIVERSITY OF [illegible] RECEIVED JUN 27 '51

SIX YEARS OF UN

By Montgomery Belgion

Six years ago, on June 26, 1945, the representatives of fifty governments signed in San Francisco a Charter, setting forth the objects for which the United Nations Organization was ostensibly going to be founded in the following October. How far are those objects being attained? The persons who conduct a commercial business annually review its progress. After six years it is time to inquire how much or how little of an asset the United Nations is to the world.

It is not happily named. For nothing is more obvious than that soon after the Charter was signed the member-States were no longer united and they have never been united since. The absence of unity has tended to restrict the effect of some of the Organization's activities.

There is the Security Council and the Assembly. In 1946 the Security Council was asked to deal with a complaint that Russia had not withdrawn a garrison from Persia at the same time as a British garrison was removed. The Council did nothing. In 1947 there was an allegation by the Greek Government that Bulgarian and Rumanian bands were intruding upon its territory. The allegation was followed by a complaint from Russia that Britain was interfering in the domestic affairs of Greece and Indonesia. Again the Security Council did nothing. The Assembly, however, sent a commission to survey the Greek frontier. Presently Greek affairs retired from the news, and it is impossible to establish that this would not have happened even if the Assembly had been as inactive as the Council.

II

Unity has been out of the question. To begin at the beginning, the member-States evidently interpret the wording of the Charter variously. The Charter purports to express the determinations and faiths not only of the governments whose representatives signed it, but also of the people behind the governments. The Charter declares that these fifty peoples are determined "to establish conditions under which . . . justice can be maintained" and wish "to promote social progress and better standards of life in large freedom". The Charter asserts the faith of those

Copyright 1951 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

peoples "in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations".

Yet it is well known that in the six-year interval since the Charter was signed standards of life have not improved anywhere owing to any action by the United Nations. In some countries, notwithstanding the existence of the United Nations, they have deteriorated. In Britain, for example, the stock speech of politicians for the last six years has dwelt on the need of "austerity", and at the moment it is freely prophesied that there is a lean time coming there. The United Nations seems to be without influence in the matter one way or the other.

The expression in the Charter of a determination to maintain justice throughout the world was promptly supplemented with a condemnation of practices lumped together under the barbarous term "genocide". Among the practices is political persecution. Yet at the very time the Charter was being signed thousands of men and women were herded, for example, in French prisons as political offenders.

Three years ago the United Nations drew up a "Declaration of Human Rights" from which, clearly, several member-governments dissent. In fact, establishing the United Nations Organization has not facilitated the release from a concentration camp or a forced labor camp anywhere in the world of one single human being; it has saved nobody from detention or execution without trial or after a mock-trial; it has done nothing towards abolishing the persecution of political minorities. Regarding the latter, at most there has been a change in the minorities persecuted, and even for that change the UN is in no way responsible.

Very likely, apart from the lot who shoot their heads off and come into the limelight, few men and women expected that the founding of the United Nations would be of the least use in such matters. But possibly there was a popular hope that the United Nations would lessen misunderstandings among national governments. The Charter grandiloquently declares that "we, the peoples of the United Nations" are "determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war". On the other hand, not even the present generation, let alone future generations, has been spared war.

Ever since the United Nations was founded war has been going on somewhere -- in Greece, in China, in Indonesia, in Indo-China and finally in Korea. The United Nations has not proved adequate for the settlement of international disputes before they result in war, and likewise its existence has not averted civil war. In 1946 the Assembly unanimously resolved to asked the Security Council to draw up a plan for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the reduction of national armaments. With what effect? National armaments are on the increase.

III

Apparently the existence of the United Nations has not rendered superfluous other groupings of States. For instance, its formation has been followed by the formation of, successively, the Benelux group, the Council of Europe group, the alliance of Communist countries, and the North Atlantic Treaty group. No doubt the Charter allows for, and, indeed, foreshadows the making of regional pacts in the style of the North Atlantic Treaty, but is the United Nations really necessary on top of all these minor groupings?

Not only has the founding of the United Nations not served to make war a thing of the past, but also the United Nations has not been able to mitigate the savagery of contemporary warfare. Through the efforts of the Organization, sixty-three governments approved the Geneva Convention of 1949. Article 63 of this convention provides that a military force occupying foreign territory shall not destroy private property unless compelled to do so for its own safety. Yet, as is well known, the United Nations forces retreating in Korea at the beginning of this year turned the countryside into "scorched earth".

As regards war in Korea, when on June 27, 1950, the President of the United States ordered the American forces in the Pacific to give immediate naval and air support to the South Koreans who were fighting the Koreans of the North, he acted three hours before the Security Council met in order to take a decision in his wake. And of course the decision of the Security Council was not unanimous.

Analogously, although politicians of individual member-States may prate of the United Nations fighting for collective security as though the Organiation were a righteous knight in shining armour, nobody is deceived: the United Nations is in this matter the creature of the United States. In addition, many Americans feel that the transparent disguise only hinders the execution of a purely American policy in Korea, while many Britons feel that if only the United Nations did not exist Mr. Attlee might clutch at Mr. Truman's coattails with greater persuasiveness.

If the United Nations does not cut an altogether satisfactory figure when a war is waged in its name, it remains to be seen if it can do anything to bring a war to its end and to restore peace.

IV

Regarding the limitations which reality imposes on the part the UN can play in war and peace, the widely-applauded Romanes lecture which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lord Hankey delivered at Oxford on June 7 is especially illuminating. With the astuteness of a practical politician, this former head of the British Cabinet Secretariat and former Cabinet Minister laid bare the weaknesses inherent in the ideas that presided over the founding of the United Nations.

It was apparently intended, he said, that the Organization should first seek to maintain peace and security, and then, if it failed in this, that it should combat aggression. But although to the superficial nothing seems easier than to name an aggressor, it is in fact very difficult to draw the line where provocation ends and aggression begins. In that matter the United Nations was never likely to reach unanimity. Therefore to some it would ever be suspect as partisan.

Moreover, the world was finding out that once the equivocal business of naming an aggressor had been gone through and war was declared against the State named, an international organization was not the most efficient instrument for waging war. As a mediator that could bring war to an end, the United Nations was equally handicapped; for it had to combine the roles of impartial arbiter and belligerent.

There Lord Hankey diagnosed a defect which the United Nations took over from its predecessor, the League of Nations. He perceived the defect clearly at the time the League was being hatched; he was a member of the British delegation to the Paris Peace Conference of 1919. As long ago as that he suggested that member-States which were parties to a dispute referred to the League should provisionally retire from membership until the dispute had been decided. In that way the suspicion of partisanship would, he thought, be avoided. But the suggestion was ignored, which is not surprising.

For, if parties to a quarrel are not unbiased concerning its wrongs and rights, no State can trust a panel of other States to decide its business with no regard to the particular interests of each. For a State to let other States judge between itself and a second State would often be to offer itself as a victim.

Law will never rule in international affairs as it rules in civil society. An international body cannot fight a war as if it were a sovereign State. The United Nations was formed in disregard of those two elementary truths. The sooner it is wound up the better for the world.

Montgomery Belgion is a noted British author and lecturer.

Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue, N. W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscriptions or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not Merely Gossip *A Supplement to* Human Events Vol. VIII, No. 25

By Frank C. Hanighen June 20, 1951

EISENHOWER STRATEGY: In the past 18 hours, the party of Congressmen who have made a ten-day trip to Europe at Eisenhower's request have returned to the Capital with veritable wonders to impart -- at least privately. (The press, for some mysterious reason, has scarcely noticed this important Congressional tour.)

Some of the Congressmen were frankly appalled by intelligence they received when they arrived in Paris on the first leg of their journey. They discovered the following:

(1) It is envisaged that the United States will eventually have 3½ million soldiers in Western Europe, while our NATO allies will have under 2 million. The Congressmen reflected long on the discrepancy: the U.S. with 150 million population, will have more troops defending Western Europe (whose population numbers many millions more) than will the West European states.

(2) The House members also gathered that the number of divisions to be contributed, according to statute, by the United States "does not mean anything", that the limitations which Congress placed on "troops for Europe" are not to be observed, that many divisions of Americans will be sent, although they will not be classified or entered on the NATO list of troops as divisions.

(3) The Representatives also confirmed the report (first published on May 9 in this column) that the NATO "European Army" as of record today now numbers fewer men than it did last January when Eisenhower first went to Paris.

Why did Eisenhower send for them? Obviously to spur the House into voting the necessary appropriations. But there appeared to be -- in fact it was freely admitted by the Eisenhower staff -- another reason. Eisenhower wanted to bolster the rather dim spirit existing in Western Europe by the spectacle of a visiting American Congressional group. The show was designed to impress the Europeans with the keen and anxious curiosity of Americans about progress of the European Army. Congressmen were constrained to draw the conclusion: European morale could not be as good as Eisenhower publicly said it was, if it needed such treatment.

Some of the group were disgruntled with this. As one put it: "We went over there as legislators to get the facts on how this program is working out. Instead, Ike sent us out to try to pep up the people of the NATO countries. I didn't notice we did." Another remarked: "Ike seems to be working mainly on the political plane -- not on raising and training an army."

Not all the Congressmen were disgruntled; some came back with a rosy picture. But the skeptics were not few and included a number who had hitherto been uncritical admirers of the European army program.

* * * * *

KOREAN FRONT: Good news, these days, from GHQ in Korea -- and yet not entirely good. Secretary of Air Finletter and advisers have returned from the front and they are not entirely serene. From exclusive sources, we learn some of the things which worry them, as follows:

"Red Air" is building up. The Red Air Force in North Korea has been expanded and is growing bolder. We have sighted one formation of 56 Russian jet fighters. We have engaged others. At least one strike -- by a Red bombing force -- on our airfields in South Korea has left a bitter memory; and one strike on our naval

Copyright 1951 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

forces was made recently, although the Reds scored no hits. Deep in North Korea, new air strips are being laid. We bomb them, but repairs are promptly made during the night. The enemy's anti-aircraft, radar-controlled, demonstrates increasing effectiveness.

News dispatches from GHQ in Korea for some days confirm the above report that "Red Air" is stronger and tougher. Of course, all this does not add up to victory for the enemy. But it does suggest that, in any future phases of the "accordion warfare", we may have to reckon (especially in respect to our sea and land lines of communication) with an enemy arm which earlier in the war offered no problem.

* * * * *

IN STALIN'S FOOTSTEPS: In the last 48 hours, a House Committee has approved a proposal which, two years ago, this publication denounced as a move towards Socialism, set forth in language highly suggestive of Article 67 of the Soviet Constitution. That dangerous proposal of the Spence Bill of 1949, named after the Chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, is incorporated in the proposed draft of the 1951 Defense Production Act. (The Spence Bill of 1949 failed to pass.)

On Monday, the House Banking and Currency Committee passed, by a strict party-line majority, the clause which permits the President to put the Government into any business, if in his opinion private operators are unable or unwilling to produce goods or services at the prices fixed by law. Thus, if the price control agency should set a figure on shoes at less than the cost of production, the President could (if the bill is enacted into law) buy up existing shoe factories or build new ones, with the taxpayers' money. The Executive could then, of course, deliver shoes at the low price, because operating losses could be passed on to the taxpayers.

This obviously serves as an open door to Socialism. Should the President exercise this power, private producers in the field would automatically be put out of business. Would they ever return? Thus, while pleading the necessity of holding down inflation, and in the name of national security, the President could, with a mere directive, take a decisive step towards the elimination of the whole free enterprise system.

Minority members of the House group, reflecting gloomily on this picture, were especially depressed by the fact that Mr. Charles E. Wilson of General Electric, regarded as a great opponent of said free enterprise system (but now a member of the Executive arm of the Government), came out strongly for the whole Act, not excepting this lethal clause. This Wilson stand recalls "Misguided Patriotism", an article by Frank Chodorov in HUMAN EVENTS (March 14). In it, Chodorov stressed the point that the threat to freedom is not in the plans of the bureaucracy so much as it is in the cooperation the bureaucracy receives from businessmen who are impelled to do so by "patriotic" motives.

* * * * *

ON THE HILL: In the Senate Republican cloakroom, they are talking about the "lobster" dinner which Taft will attend in Maine on August 22. It is believed by many Senators that Taft will choose that occasion to announce his candidacy for the Presidential nomination.

---- Sen. Hoey's investigating committee has now issued its report on the corruption in the "Truman-Democrat" machine in Mississippi. (See this column, April 4, for description of the auctioning of post office jobs in that state.) The report, it is whispered, may result in the calling of a grand jury to consider indictments of prominent members of the Administration machine in Mississippi.

---- Senator McCarthy's long attack on Secretary Marshall last Friday was, in more than a figurative sense, a book. It ran to 47 pages of the Record, totalling over 30,000 words. We hear from the grapevine that the Senator wrote the speech in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

collaboration with a famous journalist. The latter was formerly a friend of F.D.R. and wrote in favor of his foreign policy a decade ago. Rumor has it that the McCarthy speech will eventually be published as a book.

---- On Capitol Hill, Senators are interested in a report that the Bank of International Settlements will soon issue a survey, severely criticizing Western European countries for not adjusting their economies to the shock of rearmament.

---- Talk of the town in the past fortnight has been the poor questioning by Republican Senators in the big hearings. Last week, we suggested the reasons. Now, old hands on the Hill are predicting that the Republicans will go similarly unprepared to the hearings on foreign aid which should open soon.

* * * * *

FACING 1952: The Dunn Survey of Greenwich, Connecticut, has issued an analysis which should remove much of the smug confidence among many Republicans. This Survey says (June 10), in effect, that, unless certain courses are pursued, the Republicans will lose in 1952. Mr. Dunn offers unassailable statistics about past elections to prove his thesis.

This particular Dunn Survey, unlike others, impresses us. Some years ago when Dunn based his forecasts on the Government employee vote, we discounted his methods. In this column (November 24, 1948), following the last general election, we reported the results of a painstaking survey conducted by the Washington Evening Star. That paper persuasively argued, on the basis of precinct studies, that the Government employee vote in those parts of Metropolitan Washington (in neighboring Maryland and Virginia) went to Dewey. But, in recent years, Dunn has changed his tack; he has been studying the results of elections in the framework of what candidates offered the voters. In the last few months, he made tests in Iowa and New York along those lines, with interesting results.

As we all know, one wing of the GOP has sought to win by offering more handouts than the Democrats, or by pleading that the Republican Party could run the Welfare State better than its opponents. Mr. Dunn's recent surveys found evidence that "there is no great mass of selfish or ignorant voters promoting the Welfare State by giving votes in exchange for Government benefits" and that many voters stay away from the polls when they are offered no clear-cut choice between handouts and traditional free enterprise.

So, in his most recent release, Mr. Dunn says the GOP will lose, if they follow the "me-too" policy. The GOP will win, he says, (1) if it "becomes the open and fighting champion of opponents of the Welfare State"; and (2) if "nearly all of the electoral vote of the Southern states goes to the Republican candidate for President". The effort to bring about the latter is now being led by Senator Mundt of South Dakota.

* * * * *

BYRD: Those who favor an alliance of Southern Democrats and Republicans (according to the gospel of Sen. Mundt) have been examining with interest some words in a speech which Senator Harry Byrd (Va.) made before the Economic Club of Detroit on May 28. Byrd is often mentioned as a Presidential candidate on whom both Republicans and Southern Democrats could agree. An indication that "he's willing" is being read into the following passage of his Detroit speech:

"In effect, today we have three major political parties in this country. We have the Republicans, we have the Constitutional Democrats, and we have the New Dealers and Fair Dealers. It should be possible to divide the American people into two groups, regardless of party membership, one comprising those who think in terms of the prime necessity of preserving the basic principles of our constitutional Government, and who are willing to make the sacrifices necessary to that end; then, in the second group place those who think in terms of State Socialism and direct per-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sonal benefits from the Federal Government, even at the expense of weakening our system of free democracy. If such could be brought about -- and perhaps some day it will -- I say without fear of successful contradiction that the sound group would outnumber and outvote those who would tamper with and risk weakening those institutions of Government that have made us, as I have said, the greatest Nation in all the World."

* * * * *

THE BOOK FRONT: The chat columns of book sections in newspapers report that a volume based on the hearings of the committee which listened to MacArthur, Marshall, Bradley, Acheson, et al, is being written and scheduled for early publication. The authors mentioned are Richard Rovere of the New Yorker and Professor Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., of Harvard. These writers can hardly be classified as severe critics of the Truman Administration -- so we can expect what we can expect. The important aspect to note, however, is that there are no reports about any books which would interpret the hearings from quite another viewpoint. Already, many observers have wondered why Freda Utley (author of The China Story), or John T. Flynn, whose epochal pamphlet on Pearl Harbor made history, have not started to write a book which might give something other than the Administration viewpoint.

As usual, the Opposition seems to be unaware of the importance of such books. Or if they finally do awake, the resultant volume comes late. But, Administration partisans are right on the job, and early. Thus, Professor Lattimore's defense of his position reached the stands within a very few months after he had testified before the Tydings Committee. And didn't Hurlburd's This Happened In Pasadena go on the shelves not long after the educational collectivists were defeated at the California city polls? Also we regretfully remark that Dr. Rumely has not put between covers his side of the case which was presented before the Buchanan Committee. Nor have we heard that Mr. Alfred Kohlberg intends to tell in book form of his long crusade to get the State Department to say, if not do, what they are now saying about the Nationalist Government of China. There's work to be done.

* * * * *

MORE ON THE BOOK FRONT: Books may have deep-seated effects which many people interested in affecting public opinion do not realize. Recently, we heard an especially calloused old public relations man sound off to the effect that Miss Utley's current best seller had a powerful effect on the atmosphere of public opinion surrounding the reconsideration of our policy in the Far East. This book, The China Story, has climbed from 14th to 8th place, and finally to 7th place on the Times box score of best sellers; and it also reached 4th place in this week's Washington Star roundup on best sellers in the Washington area.

It seems to have had its effect within academic walls. Miss Utley in her book says that Professor Lattimore of Johns Hopkins, who heads that university's Walter Hines Page School of International Relations, has never received a university degree. One can imagine how this news affects the privat dozents in Hopkins. Anyway, there are reports from the Baltimore campus that among faculty members opinion -- which originally favored Lattimore -- now has shifted. The few teachers who thought, and said, that Lattimore was something less than perfect in his attitude on the Far East have emerged from the coventry into which their fellows had put them and now enjoy social hospitality denied them for many months.

Also, there have been not a few comments about the recent commencement address of President Detlev W. Bronk, of Johns Hopkins. According to the New York Times (June 13), Dr. Bronk warned against the preachments of false prophets and "psuedo scholars". He defined the latter as "those who in the security of democratic countries preach the virtues of totalitarian states in which they have never suffered". However, according to reports from Baltimore, Bronk's words still do not ring well with various members of the Board who talk indignantly about "McCarthyism".

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED